

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3 and 5 - 16 are pending in the present application. Claim 4 is canceled by the present amendment.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner has allowed claims 9 - 16. Applicant also notes that in section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 3 – 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Rather than rewrite claims 3 – 8, Applicant moved the recital of claim 3 into claim 1. Applicant believes that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

In section 4 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 are rejected. As mentioned above, Applicant amended claim 1 to include a recital that was previously presented in allowable claim 3. As such, claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and by virtue of this dependence, claim 2 is also in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2.

In section 5 of the Office Action, claims 3 – 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim. Claim 4 is now canceled, and claims 3 and 5 – 8 depend from claim 1. By virtue of the allowability of claim 1, claims 3 and 5 – 8 are now in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 3 – 8 is respectfully solicited.

Applicant amended claim 1 to include a recital that was previously presented in claim 3. The amendment is not intended to narrow the meaning of any term of any claim, and therefore, the doctrine of equivalents should be available for all of the terms of all of the claims.


In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and that this

application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

8-12-04



Paul D. Greeley, Esq.

Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for the Applicant

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401